DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 876 JC 700 156

TITLE	Evaluation of Community College Instruction: A Background Study.
INSTITUTION	Highland Community Coll., Freeport, Ill.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Criteria, *Evaluation Methods, Evaluation Techniques, *Faculty Evaluation, Investigations, *Junior Colleges, Performance Criteria, Personnel Evaluation, Student Teacher Relationship, *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

Highland Community College (Illinois) is currently developing procedures for the formal evaluation of its instruction, and will use this study on current practices and problems as a foundation. A review of recent research on the purposes of evaluation indicates that the most widely acceptable is the improvement of instruction. Appropriate criteria and instruments for evaluation are also investigated. They include those generated by administrators and students at other colleges; the types of instructional evaluation employed at Illinois community colleges in 1969; and the results of a study comparing the ranking of instructional criteria by administrators, faculty, and students at Highland. Finally, the evaluation process itself is considered, including approaches to it, its roles in the instructional process, the need to focus more on the effects rather than on the process of instruction, and the validity of student ratings. A bibliography of selected references is included. (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED039876

EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTION:

A BACKGROUND STUDY

Prepared By

Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Evaluation

HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Freeport, Illinois

61032

Committee Members:

Charles Jenkins	- -	Chairman
Robert Baker	- -	Dean of Continuing Education - Community Services
David Emerson	- -	Chairman, Division of Business Administration
Donald Hagerty	- -	Instructor, Humanities
Donald Tune	- -	Instructor, P. E. - Basketball Coach

JC 700 156

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 29 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

The Purpose of Evaluation 1

The Criteria for Evaluation 3

The Process of Evaluation 6

Summary 9

Appendices 10

Criteria for Evaluation of Instruction - Included in Selected Rating Forms 11

Types of Instructional Evaluation; Illinois Community Colleges, 1969 15

Comparative Rank of Instructional Criteria By the Highland Community College Academic Community 17

Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Instruction 24

Selected References 27

EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTION:

A BACKGROUND STUDY

Introduction

The evaluation of instruction at Highland Community College is currently informal, subjective, and, at worst, haphazard. Evaluation from the administrative level is accomplished through various channels: impromptu conversations; student and parental complaints; "grape-vine" comments by numerous persons; and various printed reports, i. e. grade distributions, enrollment records. Only in the Division of Natural Science has any formal system been used to evaluate instruction.

Naturally a prime concern of any educational institution is the quality of its instruction. The continual maintainance and improvement of instructional quality should, therefore, be a continuous process. Recognizing this fact, the President of the College sought the assistance of the College Administrative Council in developing a process by which instruction could be formally evaluated. The Council in turn appointed an ad-hoc committee to research the question and report back to the council with recommendations. This study has taken place over the past several months. Out of this study it is hoped that a formal evaluative process will be devised.

The Purpose of Evaluation

Evaluation of instruction, particularly instructors, has long been controversial. Historically, periodic evaluation of instructors is as old as our nation's schools, reflecting the responsibility of public school boards to maintain quality of education and the delegation to the school administrator by these boards the supervision of the instructional program. (7 : 5) Literature indicates that early supervision was primarily inspectorial--tending toward methods which were autocratic and dictatorial. In fact, only during the last fifty or sixty years has the assumption that there is only one right way to teach become untenable. (7 : 7)

With such an historical background, it is understandable that a distrust of teacher evaluation has grown within the teaching profession, especially if such evaluation is used for merit rating or for retention. The National Education Association, in fact, has recently resolved that using "subjective methods of evaluating professional performance" to set salaries has a "deleterious effect on the educational process." (26 : 66) In their definitive review of junior college rating practices, Cohn and Brawer note that until problems caused by the ambiguity of purpose and the indeterminate criteria used to assess instructors are resolved, "all rating schemes are doomed to severe and legitimate criticism, if not to abject failure." (8 : 51)

Nor is "merit" the only aspect of evaluation which has come under fire. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) has argued that rating often fails to respect individual personality, fails to use cooperative social action, lacks qualities of cooperative evaluation, and encourages conformity. (2 : 55-65) This latter concern has been reflected by the American Council on Education (ACE) which states that "a semblance of an all-inclusive mechanistic concept tending toward standardization of approved practices, regimentation of teachers, and the supression of originality can do great harm." (15 : 158-59)

In spite of this, however, the ACE admits that, even though the art of teaching is not now objectively measurable in all its aspects, "most teachers can gain from the reasoned judgements of others concerning observable aspects of their work." (15 : 159) There is good evidence to indicate that most of the faults of poor teaching can be improved upon when the individual has defined the nature of his inadequacies. "...for the large majority of teachers evaluation should be a means of improving their effectiveness, thus leading to better security as well as personal satisfactions. Evaluation then is a means to the end of having a better profession." (15 : 146)

The NEA recognizes this fact, including as a standing resolution the belief that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession to evaluate the quality of its services. (26 : 66) It is not so much the evaluation which concerns teachers as it is the purposes for the evaluation. A recent survey of Chicago City College teachers revealed that almost eighty per cent felt that instructional evaluation possessed validity for them. (30) A study made in 1962-63 by the NEA reported that nearly half of those teachers who had had classroom observation felt they had been helped by that observation. (25 : 37) Forty-nine per cent felt their present evaluation policy was sound, though it is interesting to note that seventy-three per cent of principals and over eighty per cent of superintendents felt their evaluative policies were sound. (25 : 65)

There are values in discovering the kinds of things we do best, so that we may be placed into situations which favor our particular talents. "To exist is to be capable of changing ourselves. Evaluation can lead to the identification of skills we do not have, should have, and could have." (20 : 41) Certainly and individual wishes to accomplish his goals as best he can. "He is eager to know the states of his skills, the attitudes he displays, and the knowledge he possesses." (12 : 55) The proper goal of evaluation should therefore be in improving our instructional skills, of diagnosing the precise nature of any inadequacy and seeking out the proper prescription to remedy it. (20 : 40)

If used for the proper purposes, therefore, it would appear that evaluation is both tenable and profitable. Cohn and Brawer state that "acceptance or rejection of the methods often relate to the degree of acceptance or rejection of the purposes of instructor evaluation." (8 : VIII) Further, the Chicago City College survey showed 94.5 per cent of those CCC instructors returning the questionnaire believed that evaluation should be for the improvement of instruction. Of these teachers, 63.2 also felt it could be used to assist in the granting of tenure. (30)

In the words of Paul Dressel, "Properly conceived, evaluation is not separate from instruction and learning; it is an integral part of both." (10 : 538) As long as the primary purpose of evaluation is that of improving instruction, it should be welcomed as contributing to the good of the college and the profession. In fact, some form of continuous evaluation occurs now; it is "inescapable. . . . whether made openly and carefully or made subversively and haphazardly." (4 : 143)

The Criteria for Evaluation

Perhaps the greatest recurring concern of those surveying and discussing instructional evaluation is the criteria to be used. As pointed out by the Illinois Education Association, many persons have studied and attempted to identify what characteristics and abilities contribute to good teaching. The usual conclusion is that current methods are largely subjective and thus unreliable. (17 : 3) Study after study reflect this conclusion.

In 1950 the ASCD reported that research had not yet ascertained the traits which made for success in teaching. Though some elements were known, there was no reliable measure. (2 : 64) That same year a report published in New England noted inconsistancies in over six hundred studies of teacher traits which had been examined and concluded that "Much, if not all, of this inconsistancy could be attributed to the fact that many trait designations mean different things to different investigators and to the almost complete absence of agreement upon a definition of teacher competence." (9 : 10)

A comprehensive summary of many studies compiled by Barr in 1961 include these conclusions:

a. Judgements about whether a teacher is effective or not depend upon the criterion used.

b. Criterion building is a difficult and complex undertaking.

c. There is much unevenness in the abilities of teachers, i.e. they may be low in some abilities, high in others.

d. Teacher acts have an appropriate aspect not good or bad in general but in relation to purposes, persons, and situations.

e. There may be enough individuality in raters to produce differences in the ways in which teachers succeed or fail.

f. Since teaching does not take place in a vacuum, other factors beside the teacher may influence teaching and learning. (4:139-43)

Cohn and Brawer report in 1969 that the real issue in rating is the kind of teacher or teaching held as a model--the criterion against which assessment is made. (8 : 6)

Every major study or review of the literature in this area ends with a plea for additional research in identifying these criteria. The NEA, in fact, has a continuing resolution which urges research to identify those factors that "determine professional competence" and that determine the "effectiveness of competent professionals." (26 : 66)

Still, however, even with the lack of agreement on adequate criteria, all of us have been able in our educational experience to identify the instructor whom we felt to be outstanding and he whom we felt to be inadequate. In fact, at the present time, instruction and instructors <u>are</u> being evaluated using some type of criteria. If, however, the purpose of evaluation is primarily to improve instruction, it would seem that the isolation of certain positive teaching behaviors might serve as the criteria against which an individual instructor might measure his abilities and recognize his weaknesses.

The basic instructional functions of a college classroom teacher is to introduce his students to a body of knowledge, to limit the scope and depth of this information within an alloted time, to offer expertise as to the related literature and research in the field, and to assist his students in intepreting and relating the meaning of facts. His job encompasses that of preparation for class, performing in the classroom, conferring with students, and reacting to the results of these activities. (23 : 1) As the American Association of University Professors stated in 1933, "To teach effectively is to lead, to inspire, and to guide the learner." (15 : 149)

In attempting to describe minimum standards of competence, Fritschel notes that one cannot define teacher competency by what a teacher is--but by what he does, what action he performs, what role he plays, and how he carries out his responsibility. Fritschel defines these areas of minimum competence as reflecting a person who (a) is a director of learning, knowing about his learner and how he learns, knowing his subject matter, and being a member of a teaching team, (b) has human relations skills, and (c) is an agent of change. (13 : 368)

What one does in the classroom is certainly an essential ingredient in teacher competence. Knowledge of one's subject, paramount in college instruction, is important also, but "...the possession of professional knowledge...is not a significant factor in determining teacher efficiency." (5 : 65) Or, as a spokesman for higher education points out, "We have developed an unfortunate tradition of allowing alleged eminence in one's field to excuse the scholar for all sorts of teaching deficiencies and irresponsibilities." (24 : 525)

There are, of course, innumerable evaluative instruments currently in use, each of which use various types of criteria for measuring the quality of instruction. Reviewing a number of student rating forms in use by institutions throughout the nation collected by ACE, Kent observes that most common areas covered were course goals, content, materials, assignments, instructor behavior, mastery of subject, personal traits, and relationships with students. (21 : 323-24) In the same article, Kent reviews the "unauthorized" student ratings, often published for the edification of those to follow, and notes that their content has the "consciously missionary purpose of improving teaching and thus contain comments...about the teacher's

effectiveness as teacher." Though the content of such comments vary from campus to campus, in most cases they include the instructors enthusiasm for his subject, his organization, the manner of presentation, his fairness in grading, and his personal traits, "warmth and friendliness being particularly valued." (21 : 330)

An examination of rating forms used by Illinois junior colleges and selected senior colleges reveal much the same criteria being examined. In eight student rating forms used by junior colleges and five forms used by senior colleges knowledge of subject matter, interest and enthusiasm in the subject, organization and clarity of presentation, suitability and variety of approach, appropriateness of assignments, degree of student interaction and student interest, quality of examinations and evaluative techniques, helpfulness and sympathy toward the student, tolerance and respect for student ideas, and fairness are almost universally evaluated by both two and four year college students. Notably, those ten instruments used by administrators for evaluation also stressed knowledge of subject, skill in presentation, suitability and variety of approach, tolerance and respect for student ideas, and interest in students. Administrators, however, also placed considerable emphasis on abilities to work with others and professional growth. Neither two or four year college administrator or student forms were overly concerned with personal appearance, annoying mannerisms, nor self confidence, although each item would probably be included within a more general criterion statement. (See Appendix I for itemized report)

Perhaps one of the most ambitious attempts to isolate those behaviors which reflect positive teaching was undertaken by the University of Toledo. Its study centered on identifying effective teaching behaviors and determining their relative importance. A stratified sample of students and alumni as well as every member of the faculty were contacted for free response identifications of behavior which they felt contributed to effective teaching. The 13,643 resultant identified behaviors were catagorized by a jury, eliminating duplications, into sixty criterion statements. These were then redistributed to obtain value ratings in an effort to determine their various weights of importance to good instruction. (27 : 18-22)

In an effort to test the criterion weights as viewed by the University of Toledo study against Highland Community College personnel, the list of sixty items were distributed to faculty, students, and administrators of HCC for value rating. The results were then ranked and correlated. Statistically significant correlation between the rankings of the Toledo and HCC academic communities was discovered, suggesting agreement as to respective importance of teaching behaviors. Further, the top fifteen ranked criteria include every item which have been noted earlier as being commonly included in evaluative instruments. (See Appendix III for complete report and list of criteria.)

Whether or not statistically valid criteria for measurement has been found, there would seem to be significant enough agreement among those who have attempted to identify criteria that a basic list can be developed to measure strengths or weaknesses in the instructional process.

The Process of Evaluation

Once one has determined the purpose and criteria for evaluation, it is necessary to develop the process by which such evaluation shall take place--both by whom and in what form.

Barr emphasizes that "The evaluation of human efficiency at whatever level and for whatever purpose is an exceedingly complex necessity which needs to be made with extreme care." (4 : 143) Naturally such a process can and has taken several approaches, particularly if it is used for evaluation of instructors as distinct from instruction.

In 1960 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) distributed a questionnaire asking how information was gathered for assessing teacher ability for purposes of promotion or salary. The largest number of institutions, 63.2 per cent, reported receiving information via the grapevine, with administrative observation, student achievement, and student-rating following about twenty percentage points behind. (1 : 20)

A survey taken by the ACE in 1966 to ascertain current techniques for evaluation of undergraduate instruction revealed that evaluation of college instruction is done equally by the chairman and dean of the department or college (eighty per cent each), with colleague evaluation, publication, and informal student opinion each ranking in the fortieth percentile range. In junior colleges, however, the dean evaluates in eighty-two per cent of the institutions reporting, with department chairman involved in sixty-five per cent and colleague evaluation just under thirty per cent. Publication ranks a poor last. Significant, however, is the fact that visitation is used by forty-two per cent of the junior colleges replying, compared to only twelve per cent of all colleges. Student ratings--formal and informal--are used to about the same degree in two year as in four year colleges. (3:300)

The predominance of administrative evaluation and classroom visitation by administrators in the junior college is supported by current practice in Illinois. Twenty-four of thirty four Illinois community-junior college deans replied to an inquiry as to their current practice in the evaluation of instruction. Of these, five have not yet developed a system. Of the other nineteen, seventeen use some form of evaluation by administrators, while only six use evaluation by colleagues, eight by students, and six by self-evaluation. Ten of the nineteen allow and/or require class visitation by administrators--usually the Academic Dean or Department Chairman. (See Appendix II)

A review of the literature reveals that evaluative techniques have varied patterns and processes, partially dependent upon the objectives and purposes of the evaluation. Those to be used for merit usually involve some form of comparative rating, either through ranking, marking, qualitative statements, evaluative boards, or cumulative records. Those processes used for non-salary purposes emphasize self-evaluation, teacher-administrator cooperative plans, or a general collection of various types of data by the teacher and/or administrator. (2 : 39-54)

A study which attempted to use professionally prepared tests for measuring teaching ability and correlate their results against professional judgements concluded that psychological tests, test of knowledge, and tests on procedures drew negative results, principally due to "the intangible nature of the teaching process." (5 : 65) The only tests which held any promise were those which measured the innate factor of personality. (5 : 66)

Too often, researchers argue, rating systems rate people--isolated from their task and school situation. (8 : 7) As Barr continually emphasizes, teaching acts are only good or bad "in context of purposes, persons, and situations." (4 : 152) There are, he notes, various ways of describing teacher behavior: (a) the qualities thought to be essential to teacher efficiency, (b) teacher and pupil behavior, (c) the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the teacher, and (d) the products of pupil growth and achievement. (5 : 21) Cohen and Brawer, in fact, insist that the only valid process of evaluation is the evaluation of learning, the measurement of the effects of instruction, not instruction itself. (8 : 54)

Evaluation, recognizing its basic objectives and arrived at cooperatively, can serve a prime function in the instructional process. The cooperative aspect of evaluation is often emphasized in studies reflecting the goal of improving instruction. The AACTE prepared in 1959 a list of teacher self-evaluative tools and checked them against 5303 college and university instructors as to their prevelence and usefullness in improving instruction. These were then ranked in order of successful use. The five items reported as being most successful were:

1. Voluntary and continuing colleague discussions or seminars by instructors of a particular course.
2. Comparative check on efficiency using one teaching approach vs. efficiency in using another.
3. Visiting in a colleague's class for the purpose of evaluation and improving own class.
4. Planned meetings with colleagues for the purpose of evaluating and improving own classes.
5. Systematic search in printed resources for diagnostic tools and procedures for self evaluation. (1 : 54)

Cooperation in the evaluative procedure is mentioned often throughout the literature. ASCD suggests that cooperative evaluation is perhaps "Better Than Rating" for it is (a) an integral part of the teaching-learning situation, (b) a cooperative responsibility of all concerned, (c) part of the process leading to a change in behavior, and (d) in the direction of objectives decided upon by the group. (2 : 28-33)

The importance of cooperation in the evaluative process is reinforced when one recognizes that evaluation, to be effective and useful, must be a continuing process. The learning-teaching situation is a dynamic one. "The constituents of effectiveness are not found in teachers, or in pupils, or in situations, but in the relationships that exist among those at any given time and place." (4-152) It is this continuity of the teaching process most often used in questioning the practice of classroom visitation by administrators, particularly if it is done infrequently and

without pre or post conferences. "Hasty evaluation of performance during performance is not complete, fair or appropriate. There should be a long sequence of evaluation." (12 : 56)

It is also this latter item, stressing observation over a long period of time, which strengthens the argument for student involvement in the evaluative process. Students are the only persons who hear the teacher and receive the impact day after day; they can record their reaction with accuracy. (15 : 150)

In spite of some misgivings concerning the reliability of student ratings, students are used extensively in the evaluative process. A report by Stecklein in 1960 surveying eight hundred colleges showed that nearly forty per cent were using student rating and thirty-two per cent were considering its use. (8 : 11) In Illinois two-year colleges, forty-two per cent use student ratings in one fashion or another. (Appendix II)

Kent, in her review of student evaluating practices, lists three of the principal arguments presented against student rating: (a) Students are not able nor mature enough to judge effectively; (b) Students have no right to evaluate instructors; (c) Rating instruments are subject to bias and unreliability. (21 : 336) Studies have shown, however, that students are able to judge and produce highly reliable results. (7 : 12-13; 15 : 150; 21 : 336) A study made in 1951 testing the hypothesis that a student's ideas of a good instructor changes as he grows older discovered that there is no significant change and that "judgements made by undergraduates of their instructors are valid ones in terms of permanence and maturity." (1 : 6-7)

The right of a student to evaluate should not be questioned; he has a vested interest in his instruction. (21 : 336) As Harold Howe has put it "The opinions of those who eat the pudding certainly ought to be considered if we want to know how it tastes." (18 : 260)* Students occasionally are biased in their judgements, but so is any judgement by any evaluator. People see people in various lights, projecting their own values and problems on the assessed without being aware of it. (8 : 7) Thus there should be evaluation from more than one source so that strengths and weaknesses may be measured from various points of view. The study of the Highland Community College academic community's ranking of various instructional behaviors indicates that though there is significant correlation between students and faculty and between faculty and administration on the relative importance of selected items, student or administrative evaluation used alone would not present a total picture. (Appendix III) Studies further suggest that "While student opinions may constitute an important factor in the study of teacher competence, they cannot be considered the sole criterion." (9 : 10)

---

*In all honesty, however, one must report a recent study which indicated that students in classes of teachers receiving high student effectiveness rating did not necessarily learn more than those in classes with teachers rated ineffective. Does this suggest that students often learn in spite of the quality of instruction they receive? (17 : 84)

Those matters on which student's are asked to record their opinions should be "confined to those items reasonably within the students capacity to observe and evaluate..." (15 : 159) So, of course, should matters which others are asked to record be kept within their ability to observe. Ratings by colleagues, for example, if evaluating classroom performance, are probably not valid unless classroom visitation is part of the process. In evaluating preparation, breadth of interest, cooperation with colleagues, and institutional participation, however, comments of colleagues can be useful. (15 : 151-52)

Historically and in current practice, of course, the administrator is by far the most common evaluator, often being the sole evaluator. In half of the nineteen Illinois junior colleges reporting some kind of evaluative process, the administrator apparently has the total responsibility. (AppendixII) The Chicago City College survey, though, reports that the CCC faculty is decisively opposed to administrators being involved in evaluation of instruction. Their choice is an evaluative process utilizing students, faculty groups, and the teacher being evaluated. (30)

The administrator still is in "an excellent position to give an instructor effective help," for his goals are the same as the instructor's--quality instruction. (15:148) If not directly involved in the evaluative process, the administrator certainly should have a role and responsibility for consultation, guidance, and in-service training once weaknesses have been observed. Only in such fashion can the objective of improving instruction be reached.

Summary

This study has attempted to investigate current practices and problems in the evaluation of instruction. It notes that the most common and acceptable purpose for evaluation is for the improvement of instruction. Though criteria for measuring the instructional process is not valid enough to rate instructors for purposes of salary or promotion, there seems to be adequate agreement among those concerned as to what constitutes positive instructional behaviors. Evaluation by administrators is by far the most common procedure in instructional evaluation; however, evidence suggests a growing use of student and colleague involvement in the evaluative process and recommends a cooperative approach between those doing the evaluation and the one being evaluated.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

INCLUDED IN SELECTED RATING FORMS

Procedure

Included within the replies to a request for information concerning current instruction evaluative practices in Illinois community-junior colleges were a number of rating forms. These forms, along with selected senior college forms collected from various sources, were examined as to the criteria to be rated.

Since questions often were general and were seldom worded alike, certain judgements had to be made in catagorizing certain items. In several cases, more than one item in a particular instrument would fit within a single general catagory. The tabulation which follows identifies the college supplying the form by number in each of the three types of form examined. From the tabulation, therefore, one can identify not only the number of rating forms containing a specific criterion, but also the particular college using the que stion.

Code of Evaluative Forms Examined

Administrator Generated:
Junior College

1--Blackhawk
2--Elgin
3--Illinois Central
4--Illinois Valley*
5--Lincoln Land*
6--Moraine Valley
7--Parkland
8--Sauk Valley*
9--Shawnee*
10--Triton

Student Generated:
Junior College

1--Belleville
2--Chicago City College
3--Delta College, Mich.
4--Kishwaukee
6--Loop
6--Moraine Valley
7--Rend Lake
8--Triton

Student Generated:
Senior College

1--Eastern Illinois University
2--Northern Illinois University
3--Purdue University Rating Scale for Instruction
4--University of Illinois
5--Western Michigan University Student Opinion Questionnaire

*Classroom Visitation Forms

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN SELECTED RATING FORMS

	Criteria	Junior College		Sr. College
		Admin.	Student	Student
I.	Mastery of Subject Matter			
	Knowledge of Subject	2 3 4 5 6 7 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 4 5
	Interest & Enthusiasm in Subject	1 2 6	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
	Breadth of Knowledge & Interests	6	3 4 8	
	Mental Alertness	6		
II.	Instructional Techniques			
	Suitability & Variety of Approach & Materials	1 3 4 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 6 8	3 4 5
	Ability to Arouse Student Interest	2 4 5 6 7 9	1 2 3 4 6 8	1 4 5
	Degree of Student Interaction & Independent Thought	3 5 6 9	2 3 4 6 7 8	1 4 5
	Skill in Presenting Subject	2 3 4 6 7 8 10	3 6 7	2 3 4
	Clarity of Presentation	3 7	1 3 4 5 6 7 8	3 4 5
	Preparation for Class	1 2 4 6 9	1 2 3 4	1 5
	Organization	6 9 10	3 4 5 6 8	4
	Examinations & Evaluative Techniques	1 4 6	2 3 4 6 7 8	1 2 3 4
	Appropriateness of Assignments		1 3 4 5 7 8	1 3 4 5
	Speech & Voice	5 6 9	3 6 7 8	1
	Grading System	6	3 4 5 7	1 3
	Personal Appearance	8 9	3 7	1 3
	Freedom From Annoying Mannerisms	8	7 8	1 2 3
	Does Learning Occur?		2 5	1 4 5
	Punctuality	6	6 7	1
	Discipline		5 7	5

		Junior College		Sr. College
		Admin.	Student	Student
	Choice of Textbook		3	1 3
	Relevance		5	1
	Intellectual Challenge		1	1
	Professional in Classroom		6	4
	Roll Taking		7	
	Use of English	5		
	Efficiency			5
	Amount of Cheating			1
III.	Teacher-Student Relationships			
	Helpful, Sympathetic, Interested In Student	1 2 3 4 6 9 10	1 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5
	Tolerance & Respect for Student Ideas	1 3 5 6 9	1 4 6	1 2 3 5
	Fairness	3	1 4 5 6 7 8	5
	Out-of-Class Student Conference	6 7 10	3 4 6 7	
	Sense of Humor	5 6	6 7 8	1 2 3 5
	Knowledge of Students	2 6	5	1
	Self Confidence	6	7	1 3
IV.	Professional Attitude			
	Professional Growth & Study	1 2 3 6 7 10		
	Willingness to Work With Others	1 2 6 7 10		
	Divisional & Committee Activity	1 2 3 7		
	Campus & College Activities	6 7 10		
	Professional Integrity	3 5	7	
	Community Service	2 7		
	Member Professional Organization	3 7		
	Publication & Research	2 3		

	Jr. College		Sr. College
	Admin.	Student	Student
Dependability	1 6		
Willing to Accept Criticism	6	8	
Supports College Policy	7		
Record Keeping	1		
Social Adequacy	2		
Personal Qualifications	10		
V. Overall			
Overall Quality of Instructor	4 5 7	6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5
Overall Quality of Course		3 7 8	2 3 4
Rank of Instructor Compared With Others		3 4	1 2
Course Difficulty		3 7	4

APPENDIX II

TYPES OF INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1969

College	None	In Proc	Visit-ation	Rating Scale				Comments
				Adm.	Peer	Stu.	Self	
Belleville						X		Req. non-tenured Opt. tenured
Blackhawk			X	X				
Carl Sandburg		X						
Chicago City			X	X	X	X	X	Left to each branch. Dept. designed and administered.
DuPage		X						
Elgin				X				
Ill. Central				X				
Ill. Valley			X	X				
John A. Logan	X							
Joliet	X							Some Stu. rating by indiv. instr.
Kishwaukee						X		
Lake County		X						
Lake Land			X	X	X	X	X	Visit. & Self Req. Others Opt. Instr. Developed or chosen
Lincoln Land			X	X				
Moraine Valley				X	X	X	X	Divis. designed & Administered
Parkland				X			X	
Prairie State				X	X	X	X	Depart. designed & administered.
Rend Lake			X	X		X		Visit, required; stu. optional
Rock Valley				X	X			No formal policy

College	None	In Proc	Visit-ation	Rating Scale: Adm.	Peer	Stu.	Self	Comments
Sauk Valley			X	X			X	
Shawnee			X	X				
Southeastern				X	X			No formal policy
Triton			X	X		X		Stu. is optional
Waubonsee			X	X				
N = 24	2	3	10	17	6	8	6	

APPENDIX III

COMPARATIVE RANK OF INSTRUCTIONAL CRITERIA BY THE HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

Problem

Do the students, faculty, and administrators of Highland Community College view selected teaching behaviors with the same value rank?

A key element in developing any type of procedure for the evaluation of instruction is who should do the evaluating. Review of the pertinent literature indicates that the most usual evaluators are administrators--either through classroom visitation or general observation. The use of students in the evaluative procedure is also common, particularly on the college level. A major concern of the average faculty member, however, is whether either the administrator or the student is qualified to evaluate instruction, expecially if they use different criteria in arriving at evaluative conclusions.

Naturally, if different criteria are viewed as being meaningful by the faculty than those viewed by another group, any type of evaluative instrument becomes of less importance in achieving the ultimate goal--that of changing or reinforcing instructional behaviors to lead toward the improvement of instruction.

Procedure

Sixty teacher behaviors identified by students, faculty, and alumni of the University of Toledo as being "effective teaching behaviors," (College & University Business, Oct. 1969, pp. 18-22) were listed in the order originally assigned to them by the University. Since this original order was done randomly, one may assume that the order of items would not affect the results.

The list was then distributed to all full-time teaching faculty (42), administrative staff (12) and supportive personnel (5) of Highland Community College. Three groups of students were selected to participate in the study--thirty-eight beginning composition students (Freshmen), thirty child psychology students (Sophomores), and twenty-two technical-occupational students (mostly Freshmen). Each individual was asked to rate each teacher behavior as follows:

A--Critical to good instruction
B--Above average importance to good instruction
C--Average importance to good instruction
D--Below average importance to good instruction
E--Of no importance to good instruction

Returns were obtained from eight administrators, twenty-seven faculty, three supportive staff, and ninety students. For the purposes of the study, the faculty and supportive staff returns were combined.

The returned forms were keypunched and an item analysis was computer prepared. Though output delineated results by Divisions and groups of students, final analysis was made only from the combined totals of three groups--administration, faculty, and students.

Values were assigned to each response as follows: A - 5, B - 4, C - 3, D - 2, E - 1. A total score was obtained for each item in each group. Since not each individual rated every item, the group score for each item was divided by the number of responses to that item and an average rating obtained. Those averages were then ranked for each group.

Since the number of individuals in each group varied, an item analysis of the total score would inaccurately reflect group consensus. To overcome this problem the individual group averages of each item were in turn averaged and a rank made of this average.

Once ranking for each group and the total were obtained, a Spearman Rank Correlation was run to measure the significance of the total ranking, the ranking of the highests fifteen items, and the ranking of the lowest fifteen items within the following combinations: students to faculty, faculty to administration, students to administration, and Toledo total to Highland Community College total.

Limitations

In a study of this type there are a number of limitations. The principal ones are as follows:

1. The initial list of criteria, though carefully developed, is still open to question as to its validity and completeness as a representative list of effective instructional behaviors.

2. All items are, to a degree, positive in nature. One could argue that there is no item which is "of no importance."

3. Some behaviors are more important in particular teaching disciplines than in others.

4. The student sample may not be random enough to accurately reflect the attitudes of the total student body.

5. Rank correlations do not accurately indicate the degree of deviation between ranks.

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

There will be no significant correlation to the .05 significance level of the ranking of instructor behaviors between

H_o1	Students	: Faculty
H_o2	Faculty	: Administration
H_o3	Students	: Administration
H_o4	Toledo total	: HCC total

Rank Correlation Results (Spearman)

Total Sixty				"ℓ"	"t"
Student	:	Faculty	=	.862	12.947
Student	:	Administration	=	.768	9.134
Faculty	:	Administration	=	.816	10.751
Toledo	:	HCC	=	.904	16.132

Top Fifteen					
Student	:	Faculty	=	.455	1.840
Student	:	Administration	=	.204	.750
Faculty	:	Administration	=	.672	3.267
Toledo	:	HCC	=	.447	1.799

Lowest Fifteen					
Student	:	Faculty	=	.638	2.983
Student	:	Administration	=	.374	1.455
Faculty	:	Administration	=	.657	3.144
Toledo	:	HCC	=	.593	2.655

INSTRUCTIONAL CRITERIA

Criterion No.	Behavior	"Toledo" Total	HCC Student	HCC Faculty	HCC Adm.	HCC Total
35	Being well prepared for class	1	5	1	1	1
41	Treating students with respect	11	1	3	3	2
5	Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability	12	3	8	5	3
48	Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objectives of the course	4	6	2	8	4
55	Being fair and reasonable to students in evaluation procedures	6	7	8	3	5
20	Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subject	3	22	4	3	6
27	Establishing sincere interest in the subject being taught	2	8	8	8	7
10	Being readily available for consultation with students	15	10	13.5	8	8
2	Constructing tests which search for understanding on the part of the students rather than rote memory ability	5	11	13.5	8	9
47	Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students	8	12	11	8	10
33	Patiently assisting students with their problems	20	4	15	11.5	11
10	Communicating effectively at levels appropriate to the preparedness of students	7	2	8	21.5	12
6	Motivating students to do their best	10	9	5	15	13
44	Organizing the course in logical fashion	9	13	16	21.5	14
24	Accepting justified constructive criticism by qualified persons	23	20	23	11.5	15
43	Being able to show practical applications of subject matter	13	14.5	12	27	16
4	Engaging in continued formal study in his field	28	35	8	21.5	17
15	Making written comments on corrected returned assignments	25	19	27.5	15	18
22	Encouraging student participation in class	24	21	17	27	19
7	Establishing good rapport with students in the classroom	17	17	23	30.5	20
29	Recognizing his responsibility for the academic success of students	18	25	27.5	21.5	21

Criterion No.	Behavior	"Toledo" Total	HCC Student	HCC Faculty	HCC Adm.	HCC Total
17	Explaining grading standards	45	28	26	21.5	22
11	Identifying his comments which are personal opinion	27	23	30	21.5	23
9	Having practical experience in his field	21	18	18	40	24
49	Rewriting and upgrading tests	14	36	20	15	25
31	Demonstrating a stable level-headed personality	30	29	33.5	15	26
42	Raising the aspirational level of students	17	31.5	29	21.5	27
51	Explaining grading procedures	44	30	32	21.5	28
59	Exhibiting a genuine sense of humor	37	14.5	43	34.5	29
18	Making an effort to know students as individuals	38	24	19	46	30
1	Evidencing better than average speech qualities	26	16	42	44	31
57	Using more than one type of evaluation device	29	31.5	21	40	32
32	Returning graded assignments promptly	34	33	41	27	33
3	Providing several test opportunities for students	32	27	25	46	34
36	Setting high standards of achievement for students	16	39	23	34.5	35
16	Presenting organized supplementary course material to students	41	40	38	30.5	36
46	Earning the respect of his colleagues	42	43	48.5	15	37
12	Challenging students' convictions	43	47	31	30.5	38
53	Seldom using sarcasm with students	39	45	39.5	30.5	39
60	Encouraging moral responsibility in students by his example	22	37.5	33.5	40	40
54	Indicating that the scope and demands of each assignment have been considered carefully	33	37.5	35	40	41
56	Relating course material to that of other courses	35	44	37	34.5	42
13	Utilizing visual aids to assist in creating subject matter achievement with students	47	34	39.5	46	43
14	Announcing tests and quizzes in advance	46	26	44	52.5	44
40	Displaying broad intellectual interests	36	41	47	40	45

Criterion No.	Behavior	"Toledo" Total	HCC Student	HCC Faculty	HCC Adm.	HCC Total
26	Having no irrating personal manerisms	54	49	4	34.5	46
21	Exhibiting an intelligent personal philosophy of life	40	48	36	49.5	47
28	Taking measurers to prevent cheating by students	31	42	50	49.5	48
25	Sharing departmental duties with his colleagues	50	55	48.5	40	49
38	Being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives	53	54	45	49.5	50
30	Devoting time to student activities on campus	58	52.5	53	40	51
50	Presenting an extensive lucid syllabus of the course to students	48	46	54	55.5	52
23	Beginning and ending classes on time	51	51	51	55.5	53
58	Being neatly dressed	52	50	55.5	55.5	54
45	Making appearances which assist programs of community organizations	59	56	58	49.5	55
19	Inspiring students to continue for graduate study	49	52.5	52	58	56
37	Involving himself in appropriate university committees	55	57	55.5	52.5	57
34	Holding membership in scholarly organizations	56	60	57	55.5	58
52	Being consistently involved in research projects	57	58	59	59	59
8	Publishing material related to his subject field	60	59	60	60	60

Conclusions

Since every rank correlation exceeds the .05 significance level on all sixty ranked items, the null hypotheses are rejected. There is a significant correlation in the importance rankings of selected instructional behaviors between various groups within the academic community of Highland Community College. One may conclude that rating by students and administrators is valid insofar as criteria ranking with that of the faculty is concerned.

Closer examination of the results leads one to a number of secondary conclusions.

a. The correlation between students and administration is not as high as that between the faculty and each group. One may assume that using the two groups in evaluation, rather than just one, would give a more accurate picture of what all three groups consider important.

b. The correlation of the highest fifteen items is not as great as for the total, indicating a wider divergence between groups in those items viewed by each group as being most important.

c. The university community tends to view teaching behaviors with the same general importance as does the community college community, suggesting some agreement as to the identification of effective teaching behaviors.

d. Students tend to rank instructor to student relationships higher than do faculty or administration. The latter two groups tend to rank knowledge of subject matter of greater importance than do students. Students tend to view being prepared for class and using proper teaching methods as less important than instructor-student relationships.

Recommendations

of

Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Instruction

Purpose

The purpose of instructor evaluation at Highland Community College is to improve instruction through the following means:

1. To provide feedback from students to their instructor on quality and methods of instruction.

2. To provide a basis for and a motivation toward self-improvement.

3. To provide opportunities to maintain and improve relationships between instructors and their division chairmen.

Instrument:

After careful analysis of instruments used by other institutions, the criteria rankings of our students and faculty, and research data gathered by the committee, the committee recommends the attached instrument for use by the instructor in his classes. Items 22-25 are left blank so that the individual instructor may, if he desires, add his own statements.

Procedure:

The committee recommends the following procedures:

1. Data should be provided to the instructor in such a form as to make it most useful to him in analyzing his instruction.

2. Since a principle responsibility of the Divisional Chairman is to work with the instructors within his division for the continuous maintenance and improvement of the instructional process, he should receive such data as will enable him to accomplish this responsibility.

3. To be of most benefit, the instrument should be given to classes about mid-term of each semester. An instructor may wish to give the instrument again to the same class toward the end of the semester.

Policy:

The Instruction Policies & Procedures Committee should establish such policies to govern the evaluation procedures so as to provide the maximum benefit to the instructional process, while limiting the use of the procedure to the stated purposes.

FEEDBACK

Give your instructor the feedback necessary to improve this course.

Indicate your attitude toward each statement by circling the appropriate letter.

	SA Strongly Agree	A Agree	N Not Sure	D Disagree	SD Strongly Disagree
1.	My instructor treated me with respect.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2.	My instructor communicated ideas to me in ways that I could understand.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3.	My instructor acknowledged my questions to the best of his ability.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4.	My instructor patiently assisted me with my problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5.	My instructor was well prepared for class.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6.	My instructor used evaluation procedures which were fair.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7.	My instructor was sincerely interested in his subject.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8.	My instructor attempted to develop my interest in the course.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9.	My instructor motivated me to do my best.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10.	My instructor was readily available for consultation with me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11.	My instructor encouraged me to think independently and intelligently.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12.	My instructor organized the course well.	SA	A	N	D	SD
13.	My instructor organized the lectures and class sessions well.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14.	My instructor made the course content relevant.	SA	A	N	D	SD

15.	My instructor exhibited a sense of humor.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16.	My instructor demonstrated comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17.	My instructor made an effort to know the class members as individuals.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18.	My instructor was generally tolerant of ideas which differed from his.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19.	My instructor differentiated fact, theory, and opinion in his comments.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20.	The text was useful to the course.	SA	A	N	D	SD
21.	In general, I feel the course was worthwhile.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22.		SA	A	N	D	SD
23.		SA	A	N	D	SD
24.		SA	A	N	D	SD
25.		SA	A	N	D	SD

SELECTED REFERENCES

1. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Improvement of Instruction in Higher Education. Washington D.C., 1962.

2. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Better Than Rating: New Approaches to Appraisal of Teaching Services. National Education Association: Washington D.C., 1950.

3. Astin, Alexander W. and Calvin B.T. Hill. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," in 22 below, pp. 296-311.

4. Barr, A.S., et. al. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness: A Summary of Investigations. Madison, Wisc.: Dembar Publications, 1961.

5. Boardman, Charles W. Professional Tests as Measures of Teaching Efficiency in High School. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

6. Brighton, Stagnor and Gale Rose. Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1965.

7. Casey, Robert Joseph. Review of the Literature and A Descriptive Survey of the Attitudes of a Selected Group of Educators Toward Teacher Evaluation. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Northern Illinois University, June, 1966.

8. Cohen, Arther and Florence B. Brawer. Measuring Faculty Performance. ERIC Clearing House for Junior College Information. Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

9. Domas, Simeon J. Report of an Exploratory Study of Teacher Competency. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1950.

10. Dressel, Paul L. "Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation," in 11 below, pp. 537-45.

11. Estrin, Herman A. and Delmer M. Goode. College and University Teaching. Dubuque, Ia.: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1964.

12. Fawcett, Claude W. School Personnel Administration. New York: Macmillan Co., 1964

13. Fritschel, Arther. "Minimum Standards for Teacher Competence." Illinois Education 55: 347-48, April, 1967.

14. Gustad, John W. "Evaluation of Teaching Performance: Issues and Possibilities," in 22 below, pp. 265-81

15. Henderson, Algo and M. M. Chambers. "Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness." Improving College Instruction, Fred J. Kelly, ed. American Council on Education Studies, Series I, Vol. XV. Washington D. C.: 1951, pp. 144-64.

16. Herbst, William Joseph. The Administrator's Role in Evaluation for Merit Pay. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Northern Illinois University, 1964.

17. Herge, Henry C. The College Teacher. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

18. Howe, Harold. "Less Teaching, More Conversation," in 22 below, pp. 256-64.

19. Illinois Education Association, Merit Pay for Teaching, Springfield, Ill.: 1968.

20. Jarrett, James L. "The Self-Evaluating College Teacher." Today's Education, NEA Journal, January, 1969, pp. 40-41.

21. Kent, Laura. "Student Evaluation of Teaching," in 22 below, pp. 312-43.

22. Lee, Calvin B. T. ed. Improving College Teaching. Washington D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

23. Meshke, Edna. Analysis of College Classroom Teaching and a Form for Recording Evidences of Quality. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1959.

24. Morton, Richard K. "Evaluating College Teaching," in 11 above, pp. 521-25.

25. National Education Association. Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, NEA Research Report 1964-R14. Washington D.C.: 1964.

26. _____. NEA Handbook for Local, State, and National Associations 1969-70. Washington D. C.: NEA, 1969.

27. Perry, Richard R. "Evaluation of Teaching Behavior Seeks to Measure Effectiveness." College and University Business, October, 1969, pp. 18-22.

28. Simpson, Ray H. and Jerome M. Seidman. Student Evaluation of Teaching & Learning, Illustrated Items for Teacher Self-Evaluating Instruments. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: 1962.

29. Simpson, Ray H. Teacher Self Evaluation. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

30. Smith, Ralph E. Unpublished Commentary on Chicago City College Faculty Survey on Instructional Evaluation, November 4, 1969.